

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 17-22, have been amended with this response. New claims 24-27 have been added with this response. Claims 11-16 and 23 have been canceled. Claims 1-10, 17-22, and 24-27 are pending in the application. Each of these claims includes limitations not disclosed by or made obvious in view of the prior art.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, claims were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,978,384 (hereinafter “Milliken”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0052072 (hereinafter “Jung”). Applicants submit that Milliken in view of Jung does not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim.

Each pending claim is directed to “determining first and second sequence numbers for communication from a sender.” The first and second sequence numbers are in a range from a minimum value to a maximum value, where “a value difference between the first and second sequence numbers is greater than one,” and “neither the first sequence number nor the second sequence number has a value of one. Also, the starting sequence number sent after the first and second sequence numbers is “equal to one.” This is not disclosed or suggested in the prior art.

Milliken concerns an approach for checking sequence numbers using a sliding window (Milliken, Abstract). Milliken sends first and second sequence numbers to a sequence number checker for processing via multiple level bitmaps. However, Milliken does not disclose or suggest a value difference between these sequence numbers that is "greater than one," while the starting sequence number sent after the first and second sequence numbers is "equal to one," as presently claimed. In contrast, the sequence number values in Milliken are "initialized to 0 when an SA is first established, and set to 1 when the first packet under the ESA is sent" (Milliken, col. 7, lines 65-67), giving a value difference of exactly one. Thus, Milliken does not disclose or suggest sequence numbers having value differences greater than one for receiver resetting, along with a starting sequence number having a value of one, as presently claimed.

Further, Milliken merely uses a received sequence number to adjust the sliding window for sequence number checking, and is actually not concerned with resetting at a receiver. This is noted in the Office Action on page 4.

Jung concerns the use of sequence numbers for synchronizing between a transmitting side and a receiving side (Jung, Abstract). However, Jung also does not disclose or suggest a value difference between these sequence numbers that is "greater than one," while the starting sequence number sent after the first and second sequence numbers is "equal to one," as presently claimed. In contrast, Jung merely sets "the sequence number to an initial value after initiation of the data recovery procedure," where such a data recovery procedure is based on detection of errors that have "occurred in the predetermined number of data packets" (Jung, para. 0018). This has nothing to do with any sequence number resetting that is based on multiple sequence numbers having predetermined values, as presently claimed.

Accordingly, Milliken alone, or in combination with Jung, does not disclose or suggest each limitation of any pending claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number below at the Examiner's convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

TRELLIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PC

Date: February 5, 2009

By /Michael C. Stephens, Jr./
Michael C. Stephens, Jr.
Reg. No. 45,131
Tel.: 650-842-0300